question is not a wise one. The opinion he now holds certainly has the weight of the most able, learned and critical authorities against it. "It seems to me" says Canon Farrar, "from careful and repeated study of much that has been written on this subject—of the Passover by many of the best and most thoughtful writers, that Jesus ate His Last Supper with the Disciples on the evening of Thursday, Nisan 13th, *i. e.* at the time when, according to the Jewish reckoning, the 14th, of Nisan began; that this supper was not, and was not intended to be, the actual Paschal meal, which neither was nor could be legaly eaten till the following evening." Life of Christ, vol 5. p 249. That an apparent discrepancy exists between John and the other three EVANGLISTS as to the exact nature of the Last supper, and the precise time of its observance, no authority denies, and that this apparent discrepancy is accounted for and explained in half a score of different ways is a fact patent to every student acquainted with the different writers on the subject. But that, as Farrar says the best and most thoughtful writers on the subject agree in the hypothesis that the Last supper was not, and was not intended to be in any sense the true Paschal meal, is not to be passed lightly by.

While this is true and the weight of evidence is against Bro. Brown's view of the subject it would be uncritical and unfair to deny that reasons do exist favorable to his position. But since the newly accepted view of the subject by Bro. Brown does not affect his opinion as to the typical and symbolical character of the institution as a Christian ceremonial there remains but little room for discussion, with him, upon the subject from a doctrinal or practical standpoint. Give Bro. Brown the full rein of his convictions and in the end the sum and substance of his doctrinal theology remains the same. So far then as the ultimate of the discussion is concerned, as stated in the beginning, it will not affect the interest of the church one way or the other, and is therefore a waste of time and energy except so far as it may inspire the unlearned reader to a careful examination of the best authorities upon the subject. I think it would be of some material advantage to our younger clergy to look up the authorities upon the subject during their leisure hours. It will be a matter of surprise to many that the almost universal agreement of the best and most critical authorities on the subject is to the effect that the Last supper was in no sense intended to be the Paschal meal, but partook of another and yet equally sacred character. It will be a source of inspiration and help in their work to learn with what unanimity all authorities refer to the full meal,—Lord's Supper—agape or feast of charity as a solemn religious institution among the early Christians. Such a ceremonial was as common as the "Sacrament of the Eucharist," itself and was held as sacred in character, as it was with the same frequency of observance. The meal and cup and loaf of communion were invariably observed together as first given by Christ. And there are fragments of history, especially from the Antenicene Fathers evidencing the fact that the washing of feet as a religious observance in imitation of the Lord, accompanied these communion seasons. Altogether the student or clergyman will find the investigation one of much pleasure and profit, and as strongly confirmatory of his faith in the practices of the church. He will find on looking over the history of the Dunkard church a fact in solution worth treasuring up, for future use. Let him go over the ground, carefully study all the bearings logically, and he will fully concur in the statement that in every public discussion ever held with representatives of other churches on the Sacramental observance of the church, and where the disputants were equally matched in learning and ability the practical result was a victory for our claims. The subsequent influx of members was invariably to our order, and in many instances the opposing organization suffered loss and complete disintegration. It is no wonder then in the face of such facts that wide far-seeing men, as Bro. Brown, though changing their views as to old theories still remain the same, or even stronger, on the face of practical and doctrinal Christianity.

I find that the closer our clergy study the New Testament and church history, and the more diligently and carefully they read the best thinkers and writers upon the points affecting our doctrinal code, the stronger they become in their adherence to the church and in their defence of its claims. What is here said of other ceremonials is not intended to detract from the main point in the paper, viz that the Supper as an institution is only strengthened by the controversy by the brethren though they differ on minor and indifferent points Let not such discussions obscure, the main point or mislead us in the essential details of the question. This is the only danger, with the exception that there is a possibility of their attacking more importance to the method of doing a thing than to the essential nature of the thing itself.

God and Christ and Man.

BY J. B. LAIR.

GOD the supreme source of all things—EVERYTHING consists in Him. The maker and preserver of all things, visible or invisible, hence his power and authority is supreme.

CHRIST the Son, the gift of God, the dispenser of salvation tc man, the only possible source of salvation. For "there is no other name given among men where-by we can be saved.

MAN the created, the one needing salvation, and the only recipient of salvation.

Now then, God the source and author, Christ the finisher and dispenser, man the subject and recipient.

God all powerful, Christ the medium by which the saving power of God is carried over to man. Man is brought over into relation with this saving power by obeying certain requirements, revealed, as the conditions of salvation. Now what has man to do, but to comply with the requirements and receive the benefits? But how are we brought into relation with God's saving power. Paul in writing to the Eph. says to them, "Be renewed in the spirit of your mind, and put on the New man," which is equivalent to what he says to the Rom's. viz. "But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the flesh" &c. It is now evident that we must "put on Christ." But now Paul settles that matter clearly, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." It is obvious now that by the exercise of volition we are baptized into Christ, and are thus brought into relation with the saving power of God. Not saved, as some teach, yet in one sense we are saved, but we must hold out faithful to the end, before our salvation is complete.

But if it were possible to get into Christ by believing in Him, as I heard a minister say not long since, the devils are just as well off as we are, for they "believe and tremble," hence they are in Christ too. Or if it were possible to get into Christ without the exercise of our own volition, a man might be run down and caught, and baptized by force, and be gotten into Christ, and just so with all the other ordinances. I would just ask the reader, by the way of further consideration of the subject—what has man accomplished in the divine arrangement of salvation? Has man done one thing? Is there anything left in the arrangement for him to do but to accept it, and perform the conditions? If you answer in the affirmative you make Christ a liar, for he declared that "It is finished." With these facts before us, we cannot help but wonder why professed Christian churches will presume to made additions to the Gospel, as necessary unto salvation.

For instance, where dress is made a test of fellowship, it clearly becomes a condition of salvation, and just as clearly an addition to the Gospel plan of salvation. This may be denied, but when conference decisions are made and enforced, to the effect that certain things shall not, and other certain things shall be worn, and if these decisions are not adhered to, the "disobedient" ones are excommunicated from the body, it certainly does from their own standpoint become a condition of salvation. And from this standpoint, man is not the recipient of salvation, but he is in part the author of it. Then the Savior is not a perfect Savior, but man is partly his own Savior.

Then again, if man can do, or make additions to the scheme of salvation, it follows that we are not saved by God's grace alone, but we are saved by our own wisdom and works. This state of affairs certainly places man in an unreasonable and an un-scriptural position. Unreasonable because God is the author of all existence. He is the author of man's existence, and he is just as much the author of man's salvation, as he is of his existence. Man has no more to do with his salvation than he has with his existence. Man did not make himself, neither did he have any part in his own creation, but after God created him, he had to live by the sweat of his face all his life. Neither does man make any part of his own salvation, but after God has made the plan of salvation, complete too, through Jesus Christ—man has to work out his own salvation, by doing what is required of him in the divine plan. Unscriptural, from the fact that God having arranged a plan of salvation for man through Christ, it remains for man to get into Christ as for the Scriptures, as we have already seen. Man does not get into himself first in order to get into Christ, but he must get out of himself, out of his carnal nature, clearly. Neither does man have to get into the church in order to get into Christ, but man gets into the church, as a consequence of being in Christ.

It being a fact that man's salvation is getting or being in Christ, and he can get into Him only by the conditions that God has made, the fact remains that he is responsible to God only. If man made a part of his own condition he would be to that same extent responsible to himself, or man To the extent that man,(church or what not)makes resolutions or laws as conditions of salvation, to the same extent he elevates himself, to the same extent he makes himself a partner with God in the salvation of man. He therefore does not acknowledge God as the only author of a complete salvation.

It seems to me now, that under these circumstances man gets out of his proper sphere, he does not "humble himself under the mighty hand of God," does not acknowledge God and Christ as all in all, the author and source of salvation—but makes himself a partner in the great work, instead of the humble recipient only.

If man can get into Christ only by the exercise of his own volition in obeying, or observing the conditions, it is evident that he gets out of Christ, if ever he does, by the same volition in violating the conditions, as no man nor body of men can get a man into Christ by force, just the same can they not get him out. The opinion nor action of the world will not get a man out of Christ until he violates the law that would separate him from God and Christ, all church decisions to the contrary notwithstanding, a case in point. Quite recently, I notice in the G. M, the writing of a very prominent elder in the west, concerning the certificate of membership of those removing west. His fatherly advice to them is not to neglect handing in the said certificate, and relocating their membership, befor they lose it. And he refers too, to A. M's, decisions relating to the matter, and my recollection is that the limit is about three month.

Now then according to the decisions you may be a member of the church with ever so good character, leading an exemplary life, but you conclude to change locations, you ask for a letter of recommendation from the church, and receive it, but for some cause it does not suit you to hand in your certificate immediately, and you hold it in your own possession, after three months you are no more a member of that church according to their own law. If you were ever in Christ, you have put yourself out(not by God's law)but by their law. That is very easy is it not, and simple I am sure, but it is just as easy to get back into, not Christ, but the church. All you will have to do under the circumstances will be to disgorge your certificate and make an acknowledgement to the elders or church for violating their law(not God,)and you are in full fellowship again, that certainly is a slipshod "go-easy" religion.

Every body that knows the first principles of religion knows that such is not according to the religion of Jesus, but these laws are clearly additions to God's plan of salvation, and are made conditions of salvation.(?)